UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,942	07/31/2003	Asaf Atzmon	6287P008	4966

8791 7590 09/10/2007	EXAMINER
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN	BANTAMOI, ANTHONY
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY	
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2609	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/632,942	ATZMON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anthony Bantamoi	2609	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-8, 11, 14, 17-20, 23, 25-34, 37, 40, 43-46, 49, 51, and 52 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nick J. Pudar (U.S. Patent Application

2002/0184091), hereinafter referenced as Pudar.

Regarding claim 1, Pudar teaches vehicle radio system with customized

advertising, which reads on "a method for multicasting and event of interest, the method

comprises the steps of:

detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a received media stream;

and multicasting at least one media stream of interest that comprises the event of

interest." In addition Pudar discloses detecting marker data for an advertisement in a

radio broadcast, which reads on "detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within

a received media stream" (claim 1, line 10), furthermore, Pudar discloses fetching of

advertisements from memory to broadcast on the radio, which reads on "multicasting at

least one media stream of interest that comprises the event of interest" (claim 1,

lines10-13).

Regarding claim 2, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in addition Pudar discloses monitoring a radio broadcast stream, which reads on "multicasting the received media stream" (claim 1, line 6).

Regarding claim 3, Pudar teaches everything as above (see claim 1), in addition Pudar discloses storing the radio advertisements in memory, which reads on "storing received media stream" (claim 1, line 4).

Regarding claim 4, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 3), in addition discloses receiving a plurality of different radio advertisements and storing selected advertisements in memory, which reads on "multicasting the received media stream substantially in parallel with the said temporary storing" (claim 3, lines 2 and 4).

Regarding claim 5, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in addition discloses monitoring the received broadcast stream for a marker data indicative of an advertising slot within the radio broadcast stream, which reads on " wherein the step of detecting comprises analyzing the received media to check a compliance of a received media stream segment with an event detection criterion" (claim 1, lines 6-8).

Regarding claim 6, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 5), in addition Pudar teaches a detection method using marker data indicative of an advertising slot within the broadcast stream, which is equivalent to "wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of noise signal exceeds a threshold" (claim 1, lines 6-8).

Regarding claim 7, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 5), in addition Pudar teaches a detection method using marker data indicative of an

advertising slot within the broadcast stream, which is equivalent to "wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to a level of audio signal within a predefined frequency" (claim 1, lines 6-8).

Regarding claim 8, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 5), in addition Pudar teaches how user can request purchase of a product of an advertisement and confirmation data can be sent back to the central facility at predefined times or intervals, which reads on "the step of detecting comprises monitoring instant replay requests associated with a certain media stream, said request being generated within a predefined time window" (section 0038-0039).

Regarding claim 11, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in addition Pudar teaches a communication device (26) through which information about an event of interest such as a current play music list can be shown to a user, which reads on "the step of notifying a client about an occurrence of an event of interest" (section 0038-0039) and is exhibited in figure 2.

Regarding claim 14, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 11), in addition Pudar teaches a communication device (26) through which information about an event of interest such as a current play music list can be shown to a user, which reads on "the step of notifying comprising sending the client information allowing the client to tune to a multicast event of interest" (section 0038-0039) and is exhibited in figure 2.

Regarding claim 17, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in addition Pudar teaches a communication device (26) through which information about

multiple events of interest such as music list can be shown to a user, which reads on "media stream of interest comprise multiple events of interest that occurred during a predefined time" (section 0038-0039) and is exhibited in figure 2.

Regarding claim 18, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in addition Pudar teaches a communication device (26) through which information about multiple event of interest such as advertisements and the station on which the advertisements were played, which reads on "media stream of interest comprises of multiple events of interest that are associated with a certain channel or program" (section 0038, lines 1-10) and is exhibited in figure 2.

Regarding claim 19, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in addition Pudar teaches a communication device (26) through which information about an event of interest such as a current play music list can be shown to a user, which reads on "media stream of interest comprising multiple events of interest of a certain type" (section 0038-0039) and is exhibited in figure 2.

Regarding claim 20, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in addition Pudar teaches An event of interest updated at anytime through the communication link between the central facility and the vehicle the communication device, which reads on "step for updating media streams of interest according to update parameters" (section 0033, lines 7-11).

Regarding claim 23, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in addition Pudar teaches a play count method which counts the number of times and event of interest has been played in a media stream to prevent additional replay of the

event in the media stream by comparing the counter to the play count, which reads on

"step for preventing additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an

event of interest once the event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest"

(section 0031).

Regarding claim 25, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in

addition Pudar teaches a communication device (26) through which information about

an event of interest such as a current play music list can be shown to a user, which

reads on "method wherein the client is notified about an event of interest according to

the notification rules whereas at least one rule is defined by the client" (section 0038-

0039) and is exhibited in figure 2.

Regarding claim 26, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), in

addition Pudar teaches a communication device (26) through which information about

an event of interest such as a current play music list can be shown to a user while

broadcasting is in progress, which reads on "the method wherein the client receives first

media stream and is notified about an event of interest that occurred in a second media

stream" (section 0038-0039) and is exhibited in figure 2.

Regarding claim 27, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 27 is

interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of

claim 1. Claim 1 describes a method for multicasting and event of interest, the method

comprises the steps of:

detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a received media stream; and

multicasting at least one media stream of interest that comprises the event of interest."

27 describes a system for performing the method for multicasting and event of interest, the method comprises the steps of:

means for detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a received media stream; and means for multicasting at least one media stream of interest that comprises the event of interest." Thus claim 27 is rejected.

Regarding claim 28, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 28 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 2. Claim 2 describes the method comprising multicasting the received media stream, and claim 28 describes a system for performing the method further adapted multicast the received media stream. Thus claim 28 is rejected.

Regarding claim 29, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 29 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 3. Claim 3 describes the method comprising temporarily storing the received media stream, and claim 29 describes a system further comprising the means for temporarily storing the received media stream. Thus claim 29 is rejected.

Regarding claim 30, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 30 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 4. Claim 4 describes the method further comprising multicasting the received media stream substantially in parallel with the said temporary storing, and claim 30 describes a system further adapted multicast the received media stream substantially in parallel with the said temporary storing. Thus claim 30 is rejected.

Regarding claim 31, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 31 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 5. Claim 5 describes the step of detecting comprising analyzing the received media to check a compliance of a received media stream segment with an event detection criterion, and claim 31 describes a detecting means to analyze the received media to check a compliance of a received media stream segment with an event detection criterion. Thus claim 31 is rejected.

Regarding claim 32, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 32 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 6. Claim 6 describes the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to the level of noise signal exceeding a threshold, and claim 32 describes a system wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to the level of noise signal exceeding a threshold. Thus claim 32 is rejected.

Regarding claim 33, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 33 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 7. Claim 7 describes the method wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to the level of audio signal within predefined frequency, and claim 33 describes a system wherein the event detection criterion is responsive to the level of audio signal within predefined frequency. Thus claim 33 is rejected.

Regarding claim 34, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 34 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 8. Claim 8 describes the method wherein the step of detecting comprises

monitoring instant replay requests associated with a certain media stream, said request being generated within a predefined time window, and claim 34 describes a system wherein the detection means monitors instant replay requests associated with a certain media stream, said request being generated within a predefined time window   Thus claim 34 is rejected.

Regarding claim 37, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 37, is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 11. Claim 11 describes the method further comprising of notifying a client about an occurrence of an event of interest, and claim 37 describes the system the method further comprising of the means for notifying a client about an occurrence of an event of interest. Thus claim 37 is rejected.

Regarding claim 40, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 40 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 14. Claim 14 describes the method wherein the step of notifying comprises sending to client information for allowing the client to tune to a multicast media stream of interest, and claim 40 describes a system wherein the notification means send to client information for allowing the client to tune to a multicast media stream of interest. Thus claim 40 is rejected.

Regarding claim 43, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 43 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 17. Claim 17 describes the method wherein a media stream comprises multiple events of interest that occurred during the predefined period, and claim 43 describes the

system wherein a media stream comprises multiple events of interest that occurred during the predefined period. Thus claim 43 is rejected.

Regarding claim 44, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 44 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 18. Claim 18 describes the method wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest that are associated with a certain channel or program, and claim 44 describes the system wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest that are associated with a certain channel or program. Thus claim 44 is rejected.

Regarding claim 45, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 45 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 19. Claim 19 describes the method wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest of a certain type, and claim 45 describes a system wherein a media stream of interest comprises multiple events of interest of a certain type. Thus claim 45 is rejected.

Regarding claim 46, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 46 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 20. Claim 20 describes the method further comprising of the step of updating media streams of interest according to update parameters, and claim 46 describes the system further comprising of the means for updating media streams of interest according to update parameters. Thus claim 46 is rejected.

Regarding claim 49, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 49 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 23. Claim 23 describes the method further comprising a step of preventing additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once the event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest, and claim 49 describes the system further adapted a to prevent additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once the event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest. Thus claim 49 is rejected.

Regarding claim 51, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 51 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 25. Claim 25 describes the method wherein the client is notified about an event of interest according to the notification rules whereas at least one rule is defined by the client, and claim 51 describes the system capable of notifying a client about an event of interest according to the notification rules whereas at least one rule is defined by the client. Thus claim 51 is rejected.

Regarding claim 52, Pudar teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 52 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 26. Claim 26 describes the method wherein the client receives first media stream and is notified about an event of interest that occurred in a second media stream, and claim 52 describes the system capable of notifying client about an event of interest that occurred in a media stream other than the media stream to which the client device is tuned to. Thus claim 52 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 21-22, 24, 35-36, 38-39, 41-42, 47-48, 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nick J. Pudar (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091) in view of Slater et al (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0010588), hereinafter referenced as Pudar and Slater.

Regarding claim 9, Pudar discloses everthing as above (see claim 5), however, failed to disclose a step of detecting comprising of monitoring of media distribution resource allocation. Slater teaches a demand monitor server which monitors the demand for a particular server resource, which reads on "step of detecting comprises monitoring media resource allocation" (section 0113).

Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar by specifically providing a step of detecting comprising monitoring the media distribution resource allocation as taught by Slater to ensure that the overall capacity or processing power of the server is always sufficient.

Claims 10, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nick J. Pudar (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091) in view of Ming-Chih Chang (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0154490), hereinafter referenced as Pudar and Chang.

Regarding claim 10, Pudar discloses everthing as above (see claim 5), however, failed to disclose a step of detecting comprises image processing of received media stream. Chang teaches a graphics card (24A), which converts image data into video signal, which reads on "the method wherein the step of detecting comprises image processing of the received media stream" (section 0005) and is exhibited in figure 1. Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar by specifically providing a step of detecting comprising image processing of the received media stream as taught by Chang to optimize transmission bandwidth of the media stream.

Regarding claim 15, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 11), however, failed to disclose a method of notifying comprising converting a media stream of interest to a sequence of images representative of the media stream of interest, and displaying the sequence of images, whereas the sequence of images is formatted such as to be processed by a client device unit other than a decoder. Chang teaches a graphics card (24A), which converts image data into video signal, which reads on "the method comprises converting a media stream of interest to a sequence of images representative of the media stream of interest, and displaying the sequence of images, whereas the sequence of images is formatted such as to be processed by a client device unit other than a decoder" (section 0005) and is exhibited in figure 1. Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar by specifically providing a method of converting a media stream of interest to a sequence of images

representative of the media stream of interest, and displaying the sequence of images, whereas the sequence of images is formatted such as to be processed by a client device unit other than a decoder as taught by Chang to minimize the image processing error.

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nick J. Pudar (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091) in view of Klosterman et al (U.S. Patent Application 20030051241), hereinafter referenced as Pudar and Klosterman.

Regarding claim 12, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 11), however, failed to disclose a step of notifying comprising of at least one symbol. Klosterman teaches a system that displays a symbol when searching for and event of interest, which reads on "step of notifying comprising at least one symbol" (section 0062) and is exhibited in figure 6c.

Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar by specifically providing a step of notifying comprising displaying of at least one symbol as taught by Klosterman to improve the reality of the notification experience.

Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nick J. Pudar (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091) in view of Atsushi Hirota (U.S. Patent Application 20030185546), hereinafter referenced as Pudar and Hirota.

Regarding claim 13, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 11), however, failed to disclose a step of notifying comprising displaying of at least one image representative of the event. Hirota teaches a way of notifying a user of about a

warning or event of interest by displaying a graphic image, which reads on "step of notifying comprises displaying at least one image representative of an event" (section 0034-0035).

Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar by specifically providing a step of notifying comprising displaying at least one image representative of the event as taught by Hirota to enhance better understanding of the notice.

Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nick J. Pudar (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091) in view of Ming-Chih Chang (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0154490), and further in view of Bulkowiski (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0034875), hereinafter referenced as Pudar, Chang M. and Bulkowiski.

Regarding claim 16, Pudar and Chang M. discloses everything as above (see claim 15), however, failed to disclose a sequence of images displayed in a client's device in addition to another media stream. Bulkowiski teaches displaying images from content, in addition to playing sound from content, which reads on "the method wherein the sequence of images is displayed at a client's device in addition to another media stream" (claim 7, lines 3-5).

Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar and Chang M. by specifically providing a sequence of images displayed in a client's device in addition to another media stream as taught by Bulwoski to enhance an enjoyable notification experience.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nick J. Pudar

(U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091) in view of Fukuda et al (U.S. Patent Application

2004/0083488), hereinafter referenced as Pudar and Fukuda.

Regarding claim 21, Pudar and Chang discloses everything as above (see claim

1), however, failed to disclose a step of updating media stream of interest in response to

client feedback. Fukuda teaches a receiving apparatus (200) that receives feedback

from user and updates information based on user feedback, which reads on "the

method further comprising a step of updating media stream of interest in response to

client feedback" (section 0143 lines 2-9).

Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar by specifically

providing a step of updating media stream of interest in response to client feedback as

taught by Fuduka to ensure optimal re-allocation of memory.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nick J. Pudar

(U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091) in view of Cheng-Chia Chang (U.S. Patent

Application 2002/0170058), hereinafter referenced as Pudar and Chang C.

Regarding claim 22, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1),

however, failed to disclose a step of updating media stream of interest in response to

client actions. Chang teaches an update unit (50) and execution unit (60) that work

together to allow user to update media stream of interest by actions such as SAVE and

CLOSE, which reads on "the method further comprising a step of updating media

stream of interest in response to client actions" (section 0028).

Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar by specifically providing a step of updating media stream of interest in response to client actions as taught by Chang C. to enhance improved interaction with clients home device.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nick J. Pudar (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091) in view of Virine et al (U.S. Patent 6,671,736), hereinafter referenced as Pudar and Virine.

Regarding claim 24, Pudar discloses everything as above (see claim 1), however, failed to disclose a step of switching a client device to a multicast preventing additional multicasting of received media stream that comprise an event of interest once an event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest. Virine teaches switching a user from one channel to another automatically to view another content in the media stream, which reads on "the method comprising a step of switching a client device to a multicast preventing additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once an event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest" (column 10, lines 3-26).

Therefore, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pudar by specifically providing a step of switching a client device to a multicast preventing additional multicasting of received media stream that comprise an event of interest once an event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest as taught by Virine to enhance targeting of events of interest to users.

Regarding claim 35, Pudar and Slater teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 35 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 9. Claim 9 describes the method wherein the step of detecting comprises monitoring media distribution resource allocation, and claim 35 describes the system wherein the detection means monitor media distribution resource allocation. Thus claim 35 is rejected.

Regarding claim 36, Pudar and Chang teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 36 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 10. Claim 10 describes the method wherein the step of detecting comprises image processing of the received media stream, and claim 36 describes the system wherein the detection means image process the received media stream to detect an event of interest. Thus claim 36 is rejected.

Regarding claim 38, Pudar and Klosterman teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 36 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 12. Claim 12 describes the method wherein the step of notifying comprising displaying at least one symbol, and claim 38 describes the system wherein the client is notified by a display of at least one symbol. Thus claim 38 is rejected.

Regarding claim 39, Pudar and Hirota teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 39 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 13. Claim 13 describes the method wherein the step of notifying comprises of at least one image representative of the event of interest, and claim 39

describes the system wherein the client is notified by a display of at least one image representative of the event of interest. Thus claim 39 is rejected.

Regarding claim 41, Pudar and Chang teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 41 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 15. Claim 15 describes the method which comprises converting a media stream of interest to a sequence of images representative of the media stream of interest, and displaying the sequence of images, whereas the sequence of images is formatted such as to be processed by a client device unit other than a decoder, and claim 41 describes the system which further comprises the means for converting a media stream of interest to a sequence of images representative of the media stream of interest, and displaying the sequence of images, whereas the sequence of images is formatted such as to be processed by a client device unit other than a decoder. Thus claim 41 is rejected.

Regarding claim 42, Pudar, Chang and Bulkowiski teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 42 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 16. Claim 16 describes the method wherein the sequence of images is displayed at a client's device in addition to another media stream, and claim 42 describes the system wherein the sequence of images is displayed in addition to another media stream. Thus claim 42 is rejected.

Regarding claim 47, Pudar and Fuduka teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 47 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 21. Claim 21 describes the method further comprising a step of

updating media stream of interest in response to client feedback, and claim 47 describes the system wherein the updating means are response to client feedback. Thus claim 47 is rejected.

Regarding claim 48, Pudar and Chang C. teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 48 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 22. Claim 22 describes the method further comprising a step of updating media stream of interest in response to client actions, and claim 48 describes the system wherein the updating means are response to client action. Thus claim 48 is rejected.

Regarding claim 50, Pudar and Virine teaches everything claimed. In addition claim 50 is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth above in the rejection of claim 24. Claim 24 describes the method comprising a step of switching a client device to a multicast preventing additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once an event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest, and claim 50 describes the system further adapted to switch a client device to a multicast preventing additional multicasting of received media streams that comprise an event of interest once an event of interest is multicast within a media stream of interest. Thus claim 50 is rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Bantamoi whose telephone number is 571 270 3581. The examiner can normally be reached on MON.-FRI. 7:30-5:00 EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jefferey Harold can be reached on 571 272 7519. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anthony Bantamoi
Examiner
Art Unit 2609

AB

JEFFEREY F. HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER